



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,897	04/14/2006	Mi Jeong Choi	075820-0012	4689
20277	7590	10/10/2008	EXAMINER	
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP 600 13TH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096				DENNISON, JERRY B
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2443				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/10/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/575,897	CHOI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	J. Bret Dennison	2443	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5 and 17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Action is in response to Application Number 10/575,897 received on 4/14/2006.
2. Applicant has elected group 1, claims 1-5, and 17, which are examined below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-5, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
4. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the unitary subject" in the first limitation of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting

directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000.

Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. Claims 1 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Daimon (US 7412485).

6. Regarding claims 1 and 17, Daimon disclosed a method for generating a bulletin board on the Internet, the method comprising the steps of:

maintaining a bulletin board database storing at least one bulletin data which at least one user has input on the unitary subject (Fig. 1, 3-2, content database; col. 5, lines 55-60, the information stored in the content database is disclosed to employees through a bbs);

providing a user interface for receiving data required to open the bulletin board, for an establisher, a user who wants to open the bulletin board (Fig . 2, G1 "Data Creation/ Input Screen);

receiving application data of the bulletin board from the establisher (Fig. 2, S1-2, transferring the content to In-House);

transmitting the received application data to a bulletin board operator (Fig. 2, s1-3, In-House members receive the data and examine it);

notifying the establisher that the bulletin board has been generated in accordance with approval of the bulletin board operator (Fig. 2, S1-5, col. 6, lines 15-20, In-House members may approve or disapprove the data); and

recording the application data for the generated bulletin board in the bulletin board database (col. 6, lines 20-28, after approval, the data is sent to the web server for public viewing of the bulletin board, and therefore recorded in the web server database); wherein the application data comprises at least one selected from a group consisting of subject data of the bulletin board, information on the number of the bulletin data which is possible to be registered on the bulletin board, and information on an expiration date of the bulletin board (Fig. 2, G2 shows what the data includes, for example).

7. Claim 17 includes a computer readable record medium recording a program for implementing the method of claim 1. Daimon disclosed a server computer that implements the method of claim 1 (see Abstract). As such, claim 17 is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daimon (US 7412485) in view of Knight et al. (US 6804675).

9. Regarding claim 2, Daimon disclosed the limitations, as described in claim 1. Daimon did not explicitly state wherein the step of receiving the application data from

Art Unit: 2443

the establisher comprises the steps of abstracting a predetermined character string from the subject data which is included in the received application data; searching for subject data of the bulletin board corresponding to the abstracted character string by referring to the bulletin board database; and providing the searched subject data for the establisher.

In an analogous art, Knight disclosed an online content provider system that provides the capability to collect, review and analyze posting and query entries by users, so that information from the same can be polled, tabulated, indexed and presented in forms that are of interest to the users (Knight, col. 5, lines 19-30). Such analysis of the users' posting and query entries requires abstracting character strings, in order to correctly find similar information.

One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Daimon and Knight since both teachings provide improvements for bulletin board systems and as such, both are within the same environment.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the analysis of user entries and finding similar information into the teachings of Daimon in order to provide a more efficient bulletin board system that provides the author with a plurality of information corresponding to the author's needs, thereby keeping the author well-informed about what is already provided to the public, thereby helping to provide a system without repeated subject matter, thereby making the system more efficient and desirable to use.

10. Regarding claim 3, Daimon and Knight disclosed the limitations, as described in claim 2, including wherein the step of providing the searched subject data for the establisher comprises the steps of:

providing the establisher with a user interface for displaying current situation of the bulletin board corresponding to the searched subject data (Figure 2, G1);

based on the current situation, in case that the bulletin board is being operated, receiving participation request data from the establisher and in case that the bulletin board is closed, receiving extension application data for the bulletin board from the establisher (Figure 2, G1, Since the establisher is clearly operating the bulletin board and requesting to add data to the bulletin board, such is a participation request data).

See motivation above.

11. Regarding claim 4, Daimon disclosed the limitations, as described in claim 1. Daimon did not explicitly state further comprising the step of:

maintaining category information database storing category information which is classified according to a predetermined criterion; wherein the step of receiving the application data from the establisher comprises the steps of: abstracting a predetermined character string from the subject data which is included in the received application data; providing the establisher with category information corresponding to the abstracted character string, by searching for the category information database; and recording the category information selected by the establisher in the bulletin board database.

In an analogous art, Knight disclosed an online content provider system that provides the capability to collect, review and analyze posting and query entries by users, so that information from the same can be polled, tabulated, indexed and presented in forms that are of interest to the users (Knight, col. 5, lines 19-30). Such analysis of the users' posting and query entries requires abstracting character strings, in order to correctly find similar information. Knight further disclosed a content sorting routine that runs on the computer associated with the message board system for sorting the messages and storing them such that they are searchable by users according to information categories (Knight, col. 5, lines 50-55).

One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Daimon and Knight since both teachings provide improvements for bulletin board systems and as such, both are within the same environment.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the analysis of user entries and finding similar information according to categories into the teachings of Daimon in order to provide a more efficient bulletin board system that provides the author with a plurality of information corresponding to the author's needs, thereby keeping the author well-informed about what is already provided to the public, thereby helping to provide a system without repeated subject matter, thereby making the system more efficient and desirable to use.

Art Unit: 2443

12. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daimon (US 7412485) in view of Morris et al. (US 6336133).

13. Regarding claim 5, Daimon disclosed the limitations, as described in claim 1.

Daimon did not explicitly state including maintaining a user information database storing information on a bulletin board user, point information which is given to the bulletin board user based on a predetermined criterion, or information on a field of interest of the bulletin board user; wherein the step of notifying the establisher that the bulletin board has been generated in accordance with approval of the bulletin board operator comprises the steps of: searching for the bulletin board user whose point information exceeds a predetermined value, for information on the field of interest corresponding to the subject data, by referring to the user information database; and providing the establisher with the information on the searched bulletin board user.

In an analogous art, Morris disclosed a way for regulating users of online forums in which an administrator of a forum has a powerful and sophisticated tool for regulating user behavior within the forum (col. 3, line 60 through col. 4, line 15), in which users have an index that, based on the index, limits the user's usage, abilities within the forum (Morris, col. 8, lines 45-60) and the system administrator is aware of this index being accumulated to the cap (col. 10, lines 10-25).

One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Daimon and Morris since both teachings provide improvements for bulletin board systems and as such, both are within the same environment.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate regulating user behavior of Morris into the teachings of Daimon in order to be able to control and police abusive participants thereby maintaining a more user-friendly system.

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Bret Dennison whose telephone number is (571) 272-3910. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tonia Dollinger can be reached on (571) 272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/J. Bret Dennison/
Examiner, Art Unit 2443